

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11127

supports the principles embodied in the Beck-er amendment to the Constitution that would permit voluntary Bible reading and prayers in the public schools of this Nation.

This letter was adopted unanimously by our church in our regular church conference on Sunday, April 19, 1964. It is respectfully submitted in the Christian hope that our Nation will soon again be one seeking God's guidance and not tempting His wrath.

Sincerely,

FULTON B. CREECH,
Chairman, Board of Deacons.

METHODIST CONFERENCE COMPROMISES WITH EVIL

(By Thurman Sensing)

As a people who wish to be guided by moral as well as practical considerations, Americans are vitally interested in what the churches have to say about the issues of their time. They do not ask that church organizations be silent concerning contemporary problems, but they believe that these organizations must abide by the same rules of historical truths, factual analysis, and genuine patriotism that guide other respectable groups in the Nation.

This is by way of introduction to the extraordinary and deeply dismaying report issued at Pittsburgh May 8 in the name of the General Conference of the Methodist Church. It is a report that in all likelihood will shock vast numbers of good Methodists who believe that acceptance of coexistence with Marxist evil is betrayal of religious truth and the interest of free men everywhere.

According to the news media, the conference without debate accepted a report from its Committee on Social Concerns that stated:

"It is our judgment that policies of isolation toward mainland China and Cuba should be carefully reexamined to determine whether their continuance will not intensify bitterness, and imprison rather than free the people in those lands from hardships, repression, and authoritarian control."

The report went on to say: "The arms race is immoral, futile, and suicidal. * * * Scripture reminds us (where?) that in the eyes of God the welfare of the human race is more precious than the continued existence of any nation." It also attacked armament that "steadily undermines the foundations of civilization and progressively corrupts the souls of men."

Embodied in this report is a profound defeatism concerning the cause of freedom and subtle argument for surrender.

One wonders where the authors of this report have been the last 20 years. The isolation of Red China and Red Cuba is not the result of hardness of heart on the part of Americans. Communist China is excluded from the company of free nations because it boasts of its dedication to the destruction of Western civilization, including religion. Many ministers of the Gospel are still rotting in Chinese Communist prisons. But one can be sure that they would not ask for their release if the price to be paid were acceptance of Peiping's monstrous tyranny as a respectable government.

As for Red Cuba, that country cut itself off from decent nations by killing and imprisoning thousands of freedom-loving Cubans and by becoming a satellite of the Soviet Union.

Anyone who doubts that evil is inherent in Red Cuba should read John Martino's book, "I Was Castro's Prisoner." It is tragic that the authors of the church report did not read this factual book by one who spent 40 months in Castro's dungeons.

The statements against national defense are equally appalling. The United States has armed itself not for the sake of being armed—for any extreme militarism. It is

a matter of preserving freedom through strength and peace through power. If the American people throw away their arms, they will become slaves of communism. Only our nuclear might has saved this Republic from Soviet attack.

The church report, moreover, is insulting to those Americans, overwhelmingly church connected, who are risking their lives each day in Vietnam and other trouble zones. No one in America wants to spend billions on defense, but Americans had rather spend billions on arms for freedom than spend a cent in tribute to Communist overlords.

Basically, the report appears immoral, for it suggests that Americans should be content with mere coexistence with the enemies of freedom, rather than living for freedom. Jesus Christ gave his life on the cross rather than seek improved relations with forces antagonistic to Divine will. Jesus could have accepted an accommodation with his persecutors, but he refused to do so. The Christian way is to fight manfully against evil, not to condemn resistance to evil.

The course of morality and conscience in our own time is to oppose any subtle argument for surrender to nations and global forces that aim to destroy all freedom, including the freedom to worship.

Just as the National Council of Churches does not represent and speak for 40 million Protestants, as it claims to do, neither is it to be believed that the Methodist General Conference speaks for the 10 million members of that denomination.

U.S. POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues several strong and eloquent editorial comments on U.S. policy in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record the following editorials:

"We'd Like the Answers, Too," from the May 16, 1964, Times & Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C.

"Fighters' Hands Tied," from the May 16, 1964, Greenville Piedmont, of Greenville, S.C.

"For What?" broadcast editorial over radio station WDIX, in Orangeburg, S.C.

"It's Time To Strike at North Vietnam," by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., in the May 17, 1964, News & Courier, of Charleston, S.C.

"Will They Get an Answer," May 17, 1964, edition of the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed together with these editorials my newsletter for this week which is on the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorials and the newsletter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times & Democrat, May 16, 1964]

WE'D LIKE THE ANSWERS, TOO

"Why are the young Americans who are fighting Communist aggression in Vietnam—shoulder to shoulder with free Vietnamese soldiers—forced to withstand the onslaught of the Communist enemy without having the opportunity to attack the enemy's own territory in the north?"

"Why must young Americans give their lives in the jungles and ricefields in Vietnam in the fight against a Communist enemy when the Government of the United States authorizes trade with Communist countries—trade which is utilized to strengthen

Communist power in Vietnam and throughout the world?"

"Why must our young men die in far-off Vietnam, fighting the enemy, when their Government authorizes cultural exchanges with the Communist world—the exchange of ballet dancers to entertain Communist leaders in Moscow while a young American does the dance of death in Vietnam?"

"Why must we repeat the tragic error of Korea—where 52,246 Americans gave up their lives in a war that we had no intention of winning? Must the same number be sacrificed for the same empty reasons in Vietnam?"

"Why do we fight Communists with one hand—at a terrible cost to our loved ones—and help communism with the other hand? If international communism is the enemy of our Nation, then we must fight. If it is not, then let's bring our young men home—from throughout the world—and submit to international communism's ambition to control the world. We can't have it both ways—it must be one way or the other."

At first glance, those questions might appear to be part of a Communist brochure needlessly attacking the U.S. Government. But they aren't—at least we have no reason to believe that they are.

Actually, they were asked in a full page advertisement in Tuesday's edition of the Washington Star. The ad contained the names of 127 Americans killed in Vietnam from January 1961 through March of this year. It was signed by relatives of 100 of the men, the relatives representing 42 different families.

There is nothing foolish about the questions. They are some that we, and presumably millions of other Americans, would like answered. They expose the many paradoxes in our relationships with the Communists from Vietnam to Cuba. They expose the many perplexities that worry the people of this country so far as that phase of our foreign relations is concerned.

They show the hopelessness, the futility of the loved ones who have been killed in a brutal jungle battle stalemated by Cambodia to the west and North Vietnam.

The advertisement closed with the following: "To make the supreme sacrifice in a war that cannot be won is too great a sacrifice to ask of anyone. If we are to battle, let's battle to win. If we are not to do this, Mr. President, please tell us: Why?"

There will be those who will charge that the writing and placing of the ad was Communist inspired. We place no credence in that. And even if it were, we would add our own: Why? Why? Why?

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, May 16, 1964]

FIGHTERS' HANDS TIED

News from South Vietnam that U.S. advisers are being required to use obsolete equipment in the fighting can only bring reactions of shock.

This is reminiscent of the Korean war, where Washington failed to adequately supply U.S. forces and troops had to be rationed in how many shells they could fire at the enemy. Also, planes were all World War II vintage until late in the war, and truly modern weapons never became available in quantity.

The appalling fact is that in Vietnam the United States high command doesn't even have the excuse of unpreparedness. The Nation has the weapons, the modern planes. But U.S. troops are not allowed to use them. Why?

The answer is not difficult to learn, though Defense Department officials are reluctant to admit it. It is simply this: The United States is adhering to the "Geneva accords," the rules set up in the mid-1950's for limiting the fighting in southeast Asia.

The fantastic part of this is that the North Vietnam Communists (the Vietcong) long ago abandoned any pretense of adhering to the agreement, which barred aggressive action in South Vietnam. They are using every weapon they have to win the war.

Why does Washington adhere to an agreement openly violated by the Reds? Why are U.S. troops forced—by their own command—to use inferior equipment? Why do Washington policymakers insist on fighting a war with our hands tied behind our backs?

Secretary McNamara should be asked these questions over and over again now that he has returned from Saigon. When he tells of the fine troops and leadership we have in Vietnam, he should be asked why we don't give them the means to win. Maybe it will take a decade, but that's no justification for not trying to win it sooner.

[From Orangeburg (S.C.) Radio Station
WDIX, May 12, 1964]

FOR WHAT?

How's the war in Vietnam? We have only about 15,000 U.S. personnel there. It is merely a training mission. U.S. troops are advisory to the South Vietnamese. U.S. troops shoot only when they are shot at—it is the Vietnamese who are doing the fighting, except when U.S. personnel must defend itself. That does not seem to be much of a war—and, it's half-way 'round the world—but, not to Air Force Capt. "Jerry" Shank and his widow and their four small children—one of whom he never saw. Capt. "Jerry" Shank died—but not before he had exposed to his widow the shallowness of U.S. diplomacy, the duplicity of U.S. leadership, and the bitterness of U.S. soldiers who have been sent into combat with obsolete weapons—airplanes with the wings coming off and ridiculously undermanned—as few as five airplanes to fight a war. In the May 4 issue of U.S. News & World Report, there are four pages of excerpts from Captain Shank's letters to his wife which tell the sordid story of the "no win" policy and how it is costing the lives of U.S. servicemen and the prestige of this great Nation. Here—in the living, vivid words of a man who was there—is how the "no win" wars are fought which have characterized U.S. intervention around the world since, and including, Korea—the first war that the United States ever lost. Since that time, we have lost them all. Capt. "Jerry" Shank describes the process.

If you have wondered what Senator STROM THURMOND was talking about when he charged that this Nation has a "no win" policy—if you have wondered how the U.S. State Department directs a "no win" war—then you should read Captain Shank's letters to his wife. The story is on pages 46 through 49 in the May 4 issue of U.S. News & World Report. The letters begin on November 14 of last year and end on March 22 of this year. Captain Shank died in his plane on a mission, 2 days later. On February 24, Captain Shank wrote, "We're down to five airplanes now, all of them at Soc Trang. We have actually got nine total, but four are out of commission because of damage. The B-26's aren't flying yet, but they've been more or less released. I don't know what United States is going to do, but whatever it is I'm sure it's wrong. Five airplanes can fight the war—that's just ridiculous. Tell this to my dad. Let him know, too, how much the country is letting everyone down. We fight and we die but no one cares. They've lied to my country about us." On February 29, Captain Shank wrote, "We've got a new general in command now and he really sounds good. Sounds like a man who is out to fight and win. He's grounded the B-26's except for a few flights. But they have to level bomb, not dive bomb—no strain for the aircraft that way. He has ordered B-57's (bomber-jets) to replace

them, and has asked for immediate delivery. He has also demanded they replace the T-28's with the AD-6. The AD-6 is a much more powerful single-engine dive bomber. It was designed for this type of work and has armor plating. We are pretty excited about all the new airplanes. We can really do good work with that kind of equipment," end quote Capt. "Jerry" Shank to his wife. But, the promised new airplanes he wrote of on February 29 had not arrived by March 22. On an airstrike mission 2 days later, Captain Shank flew his inadequate airplane—inadequately armed and improperly assigned for the kind of attack he was ordered to make. Capt. "Jerry" Shank flew his last mission. For what? to satisfy the theory of a "no win" diplomacy which has demonstrated its failure for 18 years? What the voter must require in November is not a change in administration but a change in policy.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier,
May 17, 1964]

IT'S TIME TO STRIKE AT NORTH VIETNAM (By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

SOUTH VIETNAM.—A nightmare. What are we going to do about it? President Johnson appears to believe that American policy in South Vietnam consists in sending Mr. McNamara over there every few weeks. To do what?

Dispose first of the narrow political problem. If Senator GOLDWATER is turned down by the Republican convention, the odds are at least even that Henry Cabot Lodge will be nominated. A politician half as skillful as Lyndon Johnson would prepare for such a contingency, and sure enough the way is now set for him to say next fall, should he feel the necessity to do so, something like this:

"Unfortunately, Ambassador Lodge really botched things in South Vietnam. I was reluctant to remove him, until the evidence of his ineptitude was fully accumulated; but at least I took the precaution of sending the Secretary of Defense there on regular trips, to check on and, finally, to confirm, the dismal record of the man whom the Republicans have nominated as their Presidential candidate."

But there is a deeper political problem, which has to do with the growing impatience of the American people with the whole performance in South Vietnam.

In the Washington Star this week I read the most poignant full page advertisement I have ever seen. It had no commercial purpose. It had no partisan political purpose. It listed, simply, the names of a hundred-odd Americans who have been killed in action in South Vietnam.

The ad was paid for by the parents, relatives, and friends of these Americans, and the message, phrased as an open letter to Lyndon Johnson, was simply this, "Why?"

Why were these men killed in South Vietnam in an action whose strategic unintelligibility is becoming increasingly apparent? What are we doing in South Vietnam, if not trying to save southeast Asia from the Communists?

Yet if this is our purpose, how long can we put off facing the strategic realities?

That situation is simply this, that we cannot keep South Vietnam free without taking action against North Vietnam, whose capacity to infiltrate terrorists into free Vietnam is beyond our capacity, or the free Vietnamese's, to cope with.

It is all very well for us to distribute literature to South Vietnamese hamlets about the glories of democratic government. It is something else to reply persuasively to the arguments used by the Vietcong Communist guerrillas.

Their favorite form of cajolery is to descend on pro-Western hamlets, pick out

the leaders, and publicly disembowel them. The effect on putative freedom lovers is said to be considerable. Not so different, let us face it, from the effect such a lesson would have on a little town in say Ohio, under similar circumstances.

If Yellowstone, Ohio, were one morning to be occupied by fanatical guerrillas who proved the constancy of their purpose by taking the mayor and his wife and his children, and the aldermen, and their wives and children, and eviscerating them for the public enlightenment, not many residents of Yellowstone would thereafter be disposed to listen to the preachments of American propagandists who tell them to take heart, and fight, team, fight for democracy, as we tell the South Vietnamese to do.

What does it mean that we do not have the people of South Vietnam with us? How can we hope, under the circumstances, to have the people of South Vietnam with us?

Why should they be "with us" when we permit our fear of world opinion to count more heavily than their fear of the Vietcong guerrillas with their bloody pangas?

But hark, the establishment is beginning to move; slowly, oh so slowly, but it is beginning to move.

It is not only the umpteenth trip to South Vietnam by Secretary McNamara. Mr. Nixon was recently there, and said—and consider the importance of his statement, in the light of his subtle political sense: that we must move against North Vietnam.

And behold Nelson Rockefeller has said we must do something there.

So has Mr. William Miller, chairman of the Republican Party. (GOLDWATER, needless to say, has been saying it all along.)

But more important than all of these, for those whose eyes are trained to keep their eye on the true depositories of power: Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, principal foreign affairs expert for the New York Times, has come out and said it in just so many words: if we desire to reverse the impossible situation in South Vietnam, we have no alternative left open to us than to move against North Vietnam.

Why?—as the mothers, and widows, and friends of the victims have asked.

Why? Because the United States is committed for better or worse to help its allies stem the Communist world, in order to keep communism away from our own shores.

We need, then, to face up to our responsibilities, with that courage, faith, and resolution that Vice President Johnson cited when he spoke at Saigon in 1961, calling Diem "the Churchill of today," and pledging to "proceed either alone or with our friends to preserve our position" in Asia.

Let President Johnson give the word.

And let this be a nonpartisan endeavor, supported by Democrats and Republicans alike; so that the bereaved Americans may know, finally, why; why the sacrifices were not in vain.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, May 17,
1964]

WILL THEY GET AN ANSWER?

In a full-page advertisement in the Washington Star Tuesday, relatives of American servicemen killed in South Vietnam asked their President to answer some pointed questions:

Why are our men required to fight an enemy who has a sanctuary in North Vietnam which is sacred from our attack?

Why does our Government by trade strengthen the economy of the Communist system which slaughters our men in South Vietnam?

Why do we provide entertainment in Moscow through cultural exchange to delight the power that backs Communist aggression and killing?

Why do we repeat the error of Korea, in sacrificing our men in a war in which we do

1964

not intend to exert the force necessary to win.

Why don't we bring our men home if we do not intend to use adequate power and strategy for victory?

While Americans beg for a government which will back them with adequate weapons, and above all with a will to win, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on his visit to embattled South Vietnam promised instead to send that country "economic assistance." At the same time Secretary of State Dean Rusk at a NATO meeting at The Hague asked our allies for "nonmilitary" aid for South Vietnam.

The history of erosion and decay of America's defense and of its honor, which began with the determination against a victory in Korea, and which has continued to disgrace us through the Red aggressions and provocations in Laos, Cuba, Zanzibar, Panama, and even in subversive activities in our own country, provides an answer to the mothers of men slain in South Vietnam.

That answer is that there will be no answer, except a continuation of the present drift, until the people of this Nation rise up in their indignation and install a responsible national administration in Washington.

STROM THURMOND REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE: A POINT OF HONOR

(By STROM THURMOND, U.S. Senator from South Carolina)

Since the end of World War II, U.S. official attitude and policy has moved further and further away from the premise that "in war, there is no substitute for victory." Thus in the continuing cold war and in its frequent outbreaks into bloody combat, the United States has been bent on containing the spread of communism, seeking a stalemate, or more recently, in reaching an accommodation through which the conflict might hopefully be liquidated.

The effects of such attitudes and policies extend beyond the more obvious losses in territory, captivity of peoples by communism, or propaganda defeats. There is a fallout effect from such attitudes and policy on the national character of the United States. Rarely calculated is the damage to the honor, self-respect, and integrity of the national character from years of following a "no-win" policy.

The first major blow to the Nation's self-respect was suffered when more than 54,000 Americans gave their lives and 105,000 were wounded in Korea to achieve a stalemate. Beldom phrased, but ever present is the question, did the Nation keep faith with those who made the supreme sacrifice?

Another of the more conspicuous events damaging our self-respect was the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961. Cuban patriots were sent into Cuba on a U.S. financed and planned invasion, which, because of the timidity of U.S. policy, was predoomed to failure. Many of the Cuban patriots paid with their lives, and the remainder were captured by Castro's forces. In this instance the United States sought to purge its image, and to the extent possible, redeem its honor, by indirectly paying ransom to the Communists for the release of the prisoners.

Since 1961, the United States has been engaged in a war in southeast Asia. Americans are carrying a major burden in the fighting, although under the pretense of training our South Vietnamese allies.

Years ago, the United States made the correct decision that southeast Asia is vital to U.S. security and thus the area must be defended from Communist takeover. As a result, we have been supporting a defensive war—one in which the initiative has been intentionally forfeited to the Communists

and in which the Communists have been permitted to make the ground rules of the war. In addition, the Communist forces have been allowed to maintain a sanctuary in countries adjoining the South Vietnamese battlefield—in Laos, North Vietnam, and Cambodia.

Under such circumstances, the American and Vietnamese forces fighting the Communists have been virtually precluded from victory. The Americans fighting the war have been long aware that they were being required to fight with their hands tied behind their backs.

Recent reports have revealed that this is not the only impediment to the American forces in South Vietnam. Our military men are having to fight in many cases without adequate weapons. Often they have been armed with obsolete and defective weapons of World War II vintage. Many of our servicemen have lost their lives because of this deficient equipment. The United States has been holding back its modern armaments because of our policymakers' fear of escalating the war.

No ransom payments can erase or even mitigate the shame of our Nation incurred in the sacrifice of Americans in a won't win war. There is no way to make up the breach of faith of the Nation to those who sacrifice their lives because the best equipment and armaments available were withheld from them in the fight which our Nation asked them to wage.

If we allow southeast Asia to fall, those who gave their lives already will have died in vain. If our forces are required to fight on with poor equipment and poorer policies that preclude victory, our military men will draw their own judgment as to the state of our national integrity and honor.

Our Nation's birth resulted from the pledge of our forefathers to each other of "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Americans must soon realize that the toll of U.S. policy must be measured not only in lives and fortunes, but also in loss to "our sacred honor."

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

OPPOSITION TO EXPANSION OF WESTERN TRADE WITH COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS—ACTION BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AFL-CIO

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the current climate of increasing pressures for trade by the United States with the Communist nations of the world, the action of the executive council of the AFL-CIO yesterday is most refreshing. The following article appeared in the today's issue of the Washington Daily News:

The AFL-CIO Executive Council is opposed to any expansion of Western trade with Communist governments.

The council said at its spring meeting yesterday that Soviet Premier Khrushchev is trying to spread "illusions, confusion, and division" among Western nations to lull them into a false sense of security.

It said increased trade could strengthen Russia and her satellites for more offensive actions against the free world.

Mr. President, the executive council of the AFL-CIO is to be congratulated for its clear sighted understanding on the matter of East-West trade. Business organizations, such as the U.S. Chamber

of Commerce, would do well to heed the sound position on this subject taken by the AFL-CIO.

CATTLE CRISIS WORSENS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was gratifying to note in the remarks of President Johnson last week to the National Farm Editors Association concern for the seriously depressed cattle market in America.

The President told the editors, "One of the big problems today is beef." Many Members of the Senate—on both sides of the aisle—can take credit for helping to focus the President's attention on the problem.

Unhappily, however, the administration's plans for solving the difficulty will not do the job. And meanwhile, the problem itself worsens.

The Department of Agriculture has reported that during the first week in May the average price of Choice slaughter steers in Omaha plunged below \$20 per hundred pounds for the first time in many years. The price average for the week was \$19.42, lower than the average for May in any year since OPA ceilings were taken off in 1946. Cattle prices at other markets have shown comparable declines.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks a table I have prepared showing the steady decline in prices on the Omaha market since the beginning of the year, and compared with last year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Weekly average prices, Choice slaughter steers, Omaha, dollars per 100 pounds, with comparisons with same week of year before

	1964	Same week, 1963
Week ending:		
Jan. 2.....	\$21.40	\$26.68
Jan. 9.....	22.32	26.96
Jan. 16.....	22.49	26.79
Jan. 23.....	21.89	25.54
Jan. 30.....	21.54	24.85
Feb. 6.....	21.25	24.85
Feb. 13.....	20.73	23.93
Feb. 20.....	20.34	23.94
Feb. 27.....	20.37	23.55
Mar. 5.....	20.69	22.06
Mar. 12.....	21.00	21.71
Mar. 19.....	20.85	22.54
Mar. 26.....	21.14	22.98
Apr. 2.....	20.79	23.24
Apr. 9.....	20.66	23.00
Apr. 16.....	20.65	22.79
Apr. 23.....	20.24	22.11
Apr. 30.....	20.18	22.21
May 7.....	19.42	22.00
Monthly averages:		
January.....	22.04	26.09
February.....	20.65	24.03
March.....	20.91	22.53
April.....	20.44	22.71

Source: Various issues, Livestock-Meat-Wool Market News, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HRUSKA. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a table showing average May prices at Chicago since 1946.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

11130

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20

Slaughter steer prices: Average cost per hundred pounds of sales out of 1st hands, Choice, Chicago, month of May 1946 to date

	May average		May average
1946	\$18.55	1956	\$20.70
1947	24.22	1957	23.31
1948	30.91	1958	28.83
1949	24.92	1959	29.24
1950	28.19	1960	27.43
1951	36.52	1961	23.43
1952	34.17	1962	26.02
1953	22.36	1963	22.61
1954	24.25	1964	20.46
1955	23.09		

¹ Average of week ended May 7, 1964.

Source: Livestock and Meat Statistics 1962, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and various issues, Livestock-Meat-Wool Market News, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was against this bleak market situation that the President told the farm editors that Government beef buying programs, coupled with anticipated reductions in imports "will be the same as reducing imports to the 1958-62 level."

Despite the President's claim that he knows this problem and that very little of his information is secondhand, somebody obviously has misled him. The figures he cited to the editors at the White House just will not stand scrutiny.

First, the President said that beef imports in 1964 will be down 20 percent from last year.

The inescapable fact is that one-third of the year is already gone and far from being down, imports this year are well above 1963, not below.

Figures published by the Department of Agriculture in its weekly Livestock Meat-Wool Market News show for the first 3 months of this year, imports from all sources of fresh and frozen beef and veal, for 1963 to be 190 million pounds; for 1964, 230 million pounds, an increase so far this year of 40 million pounds.

The President speaks of a reduction in imports of 225 million pounds. If Australia and New Zealand have really agreed to a further reduction in their shipments, they will have to make drastic cuts during the remainder of 1964 to achieve an overall reduction of 20 percent. If 1964 imports continue to exceed 1963 imports at the current rate, the 1964 volume would be 160 million pounds greater than 1963, not 225 million pounds less.

The other promise the President made concerns the Government's beef buying program. Any purchases of beef will help the market to some extent, of course. The trouble is that it is simply impossible for this effort to absorb sufficient beef to make any great difference in the market price.

Let us analyze the Government's latest announcement on military purchases. The President speaks of increased purchases amounting to 100 million pounds. Of that, about 27 million pounds represent boneless beef going into the pipeline. That is, instead of keeping a 30- to 45-day supply on hand at all times, the Defense Department will keep a 100- to 120-day supply. In effect, they are stockpiling beef—buying up a tiny bit of the surplus and holding it off the market. This only means less of a purchase later.

In addition, a large part of these military purchases of beef, about 25 million pounds, will simply replace other items

in the diet, principally pork. This is not going to be of any real benefit to the livestock markets at all. Whatever little benefit is received by the cattleman will be lost by the swine producer.

The Government is also to start placing U.S. beef in our oversea commissaries, and we are told this will absorb an additional 58 million pounds. But that figure represents a full year's requirement for this purpose, with 4 months of this year already gone. Furthermore, it is expressed in terms of carcass weight, whereas all the figures on imports from Australia and New Zealand represent boneless beef. When allowance is made for this factor, only about 25 million pounds of beef will be accounted for through this device.

Incidentally, Mr. President, observe how minuscule these figures are, compared with the total size of our national production of beef. Last year, our people consumed a grand total of 18.6 billion pounds of beef. How can the Government think to affect seriously a market of such tremendous magnitude by purchases of 27 million pounds here, and 25 million pounds there? Is it not obvious that this problem cannot be solved by such methods?

President Johnson also referred to meat purchases by the Department of Agriculture which were announced during Senate debate on the Hruska amendment to reduce imports.

Again the performance cannot hope to match the promise. The President said the Department would buy 480 million pounds, but the fact is that in 10 weeks, the Department has bought only 62½ million pounds through May 8, or between 6 and 7 million pounds a week. To reach a target of 480 million pounds, the Department would have to buy at double that rate each week for the rest of the year, and then find a means of disposing of it.

What would be done with this much beef? We have not been told, but some press reports have carried a hint of the answer. A news leak suggests that American beef will be worked into the food-for-peace program, and shipped abroad. Is that not a little absurd, on the face of it? First, we permit the importation of vast quantities of foreign beef, to take over over a tenth of our own market. Then, we find ourselves with surpluses of American-produced beef, because the imports have taken away our market. So, the Government proceeds, with the taxpayers' money, to buy up the American-beef surplus which has been thus artificially created, and ship it out of the country, to give it away to foreign countries, as food for peace.

It is good to know that the President is concerned, and any of these actions may be helpful in some degree. But it is ridiculous to allow the market to be ruined by a flood of foreign beef, and then expect the administration to be bailed out with the taxes of the very Nebraska cattlemen who have been damaged. The benefit of any tax dollars so expended should go to the taxpaying American stockman and not to the beef producers of foreign nations.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, the administration has come through with another proposal which can only be described as

incredible. The war on poverty contingent, all innocent of the facts of the life about the beef surplus, have laid plans to step up the production of beef in Appalachia and elsewhere. This, too, would be accomplished by liberal grants of the taxpayer's money, used in competition with private capital of present producers and feeders.

Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., in testimony before the House Public Works Committee, gave the dimensions of the administration's plan for the region it likes to call Appalachia. He said:

The agriculture and timber provisions of this bill amply demonstrate this principle of comprehensive management of natural resources. By stimulating the production of beef cattle in Appalachia through a regional pasture improvement program, we have estimated an additional gross income to farmers of \$690 million over a 5-year period, and a continuing gross income of approximately \$230 million annually.

Mr. President, a continuing gross income of approximately \$230 million annually implies the marketing of about 1 billion pounds of beef cattle on the hoof each year—probably a million head or more, over and above the number of cattle now produced and sold by that area.

Throughout the long controversy over beef imports, the administration has insisted that domestic overproduction was the real reason for the bottom dropping out of the market. Those of wanting to roll back imports have never denied that our own production has increased, and that this increase has affected the market.

The Appalachia plan would simply drive livestock prices down further. This would be a disservice not only to those now in the cattle business, but to the very farmers in Appalachia who are supposed to be the beneficiaries.

Mr. President, this administration is fond of quoting figures about the condition of the economy, but for some strange reason it never advertises the statistics dealing with the economic condition of the farmer. The farmer is entitled to parity, and he was promised by this administration that he would be given price supports at the level of 90 percent of parity.

During the Eisenhower years the parity ratio averaged 84.5 percent. What is it now? Last month it dropped to 75 percent, the lowest monthly figure in 24 years, according to official Agriculture Department figures.

Under the price support pledge of the Democratic platform, the wheat farmer was promised a support price of \$2.28 a bushel for his wheat; but his average price is only \$1.94. He was promised a support price of \$1.40 a bushel for corn, but receives only \$1.14.

Add it all together, and it is clear that the farmer is not sharing in the national prosperity. The total net income of farm operators fell from \$13.3 billion in 1962 to \$12.8 billion in 1963, a decline of about 4 percent, and the Department of Agriculture concedes that farm income will fall yet further this year. How much, they do not predict. Last fall, the prediction was for a decline of about 5 percent, but if cattle prices continue as low as they have been, that forecast of a